

REMARKS

Claims 1-22 were previously pending in this patent application. Claims 1-22 stand rejected. Herein, Claims 1, 8, 15, 16, 17, and 21-22 have been amended. Support for the amendments to the claims is found on, but not limited to, Figures 2-3C, page 4 lines 13-21, page 5 lines 1-8, page 6 lines 1-21, page 7 lines 1-8, page 8 lines 18-20, and page 9 lines 1-16 of the Specification. Accordingly, after this Amendment and Response After Final Action, Claims 1-22 remain pending in this patent application. Further examination and reconsideration in view of the claims, remarks, and arguments set forth below is respectfully requested.

35 U.S.C. Section 102(b) Rejections

Claims 1-22 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Lord et al., U.S. Patent Application Publication No. US2003/0028514 (hereafter Lord). These rejections are respectfully traversed.

Independent Claim 1 recites (as amended):

“A method of providing shared objects and node-specific objects in a cluster file system, said method comprising:

providing to a particular shared object an attribute that indicates any object created in said particular shared object from this point in time will be designated as node-specific while any object existing in said particular shared object prior to providing said attribute maintains designation as shared; and

when a node causes a file system operation that is node-specific to be performed by accessing said particular shared object, performing said file system operation in an alternate directory corresponding to said node, wherein said alternate directory supports a node-specific object, wherein any object designated as shared in said particular shared object is available to a plurality of nodes, and wherein any object designated as node-specific in said particular shared object is available solely to a corresponding node of said nodes.” (emphasis added)

It is respectfully asserted that Lord does not disclose the present invention as recited in Independent Claim 1. At page 2 of the Final Office Action, it is stated that paragraph 0093 of Lord teaches “shared objects” by disclosing the node being enabled in the cluster to share all of the files on the disk. Also, at page 2 of the Final Office Action, it is argued that paragraph 0072 of Lord teaches node specific objects by disclosing the specific node data structure for the file systems. Further, the Final Office Action implies, at page 3, that “extended attributes” of paragraph 0096 of Lord correspond to the “attribute” recited in Independent Claim 1.

There is no discussion in Lord concerning the effect of associating the “extended attributes” with a filesystem object. While the claim limitations of Independent Claim 1 recite, “providing to a particular shared object an attribute that indicates any object created in said particular shared object from this point in time will be designated as node-specific while any object existing in said particular shared object prior to providing said attribute maintains designation as shared,” (emphasis added). The “attribute” of Independent Claim 1 is clearly distinguishable from the “extended attributes” of paragraph 0096 of Lord since the “extended attributes” do not indicate creation of node-specific objects in the shared object from the point in time of providing the attribute and do not provide for maintaining the designation as shared for any object existing in the shared object prior to providing the attribute.

Continuing, Independent Claim 1 recites the claim limitation, “wherein any object designated as shared in said particular shared object is available to a plurality of nodes, and wherein any object designated as node-specific in said particular shared object is available solely to a corresponding node of said

nodes,” (emphasis added). This is clearly distinguishable from the “specific node data structure for the file systems” (node-specific object) and “share all of the files on the disk” (shared object) of Lord since no object is designated as node-specific in the shared object to be available solely to a corresponding node of the nodes.

Lord fails to disclose all the claim limitations of Independent Claim 1. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that Independent Claim 1 is not anticipated by Lord and is in condition for allowance.

Dependent Claims 2-7 are dependent on allowable Independent Claim 1, which is allowable over Lord. Hence, it is respectfully submitted that Dependent Claims 2-7 are patentable over Lord for the reasons discussed above.

With respect to Independent Claims 8 and 15, it is respectfully submitted that Independent Claims 8 and 15 have similar limitations as Independent Claim 1. Independent Claim 8 recites the claim limitations, “providing to a particular shared object an attribute that indicates any object created in said particular shared object from this point in time will be designated as node-specific while any object existing in said particular shared object prior to providing said attribute maintains designation as shared,” (emphasis added), and, “wherein any object designated as shared in said particular shared object is available to a plurality of nodes, and wherein any object designated as node-specific in said particular shared object is available solely to a corresponding node of said nodes,” (emphasis added).

Further, Independent Claim 15 recites the limitations, “a cluster file system configured to automatically provide support for node-specific objects in a shared object, wherein said cluster file system is configured to provide to said shared object an attribute that indicates any object created in said shared object from this point in time will be designated as node-specific while any object existing in said shared object prior to providing said attribute maintains designation as shared, wherein any object designated as shared in said shared object is available to said nodes, and wherein any object designated as node-specific in said shared object is available solely to a corresponding node of said nodes,” (emphasis added). As argued above, Lord fails to disclose the cited claim limitations of Independent Claims 8 and 15. Hence, it is respectfully submitted that Independent Claims 8 and 15 are not anticipated by Lord for the reasons discussed with respect to Independent Claim 1.

Dependent Claims 9-14 and Dependent Claims 16-22 are dependent on allowable Independent Claims 8 and 15, respectfully, which are allowable over Lord. Hence, it is respectfully submitted that Dependent Claims 9-14 and Dependent Claims 16-22 are patentable over Lord for the reasons discussed above.

CONCLUSION

It is respectfully submitted that the above claims, arguments and remarks overcome all rejections and objections. All remaining claims (Claims 1-22) are neither anticipated nor obvious in view of the cited references. For at least the above-presented reasons, it is respectfully submitted that all remaining claims (Claims 1-22) are in condition for allowance.

The Examiner is urged to contact Applicants' undersigned representative if the Examiner believes such action would expedite resolution of the present Application.

Please charge any additional fees or apply any credits to our PTO deposit account number: 23-0085.

Respectfully submitted,

MURABITO HAO & BARNES, LLP

Dated: 4/12/2007

Jose S. Garcia

Jose S. Garcia
Registration No. 43,628

Two North Market Street, Third Floor
San Jose, CA 95113
(408) 938-9080 ext. 128 Direct Line
(408) 938-9060 General Line